Attorney Docket: 678-650 (P9673)

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kiyosawa et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,187,514) in view of *Preker* (U.S. Patent 5,598,469); and Claims 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kiyosawa et al.* in view of *Preker* and further in view of *Ala-Lehtimaki et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,877,709).

With regards to independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Kiyosawa et al.* discloses all the elements of the claims except for a plurality of key tops arranged in tight contact in a matrix of rows and columns, which is allegedly disclosed in *Preker*. Specifically, the Examiner states that *Kiyosawa et al.* teaches a method for forming a pad character in a push button switch with a key film 40 (Fig. 1) having a plurality of upper protrusions in contact with bottom surfaces of the key tops, a plurality of lower protrusions as contact points spaced (Fig. 1 and col. 5, line 61- col. 6, line 6) from metal domes 21 (Fig. 1) and having at least one spacer (col. 3, line 62-col. 4, line 8 and col. 8, lines 14-26).

However, *Kiyosawa et al.* does not disclose, teach or suggest a wide keypad comprising "a key film having ... recesses between the upper protrusions" and "a key frame inserted into the recesses of the key film and having at least one spacer extended upward for providing space in which the key tops move up and down between the upper casing frame and the key film" as is recited in Claim 1. *Preker* does not disclose recesses between the upper protrusion and key frame inserted into the recesses of the key film, as recited in Claim 1. As such, *Preker* does not cure the deficiencies of *Kiyosawa et al.* 

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claim 1 of the present invention, as *Kiyosawa et al.* in view of *Preker* clearly does not disclose recesses between the upper protrusion and key frame inserted into the recesses of the key film. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding independent Claim 4, similar arguments apply to distinguish the device of independent Claim 4 from *Kiyosawa et al.* in view of *Preker* and *Ala-Lehtimaki et al.* as were used above to distinguish the device of independent Claim 1 from *Kiyosawa et al.* in view of *Preker. Ala-Lehtimaki et al.* does not disclose a key film having recesses between the upper protrusions and a conductive key frame inserted into the recesses of the key film, as recited in Claim 4. As such, *Ala-Lehtimaki et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of *Kiyosawa et al.* and *Preker.* Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect with this rejection and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Without conceding the patentability per se of the dependent claims, it is respectfully submitted that they are likewise patentable by virtue of their dependencies on their respective independent claims. Thus, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2, 3 and 5-7 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-7, are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview

Attorney Docket: <u>678-650 (P9673)</u>

may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to phone Applicant's attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted

Paul V. Farrell Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP

333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-8484

PJF/JWK/las